EXHIBIT 19

Kreynin 2017 Consensus Feedback Statement


Lawyer Reviews - Summary Reviews

Associate: Cardwell, Kaloma Reviewer: Kreynin, Leonard Review Date: December 19, 2016

1. Review Type:

Annual Review

2. Principal matters worked on by the reviewee which were considered in the evaluation:



[September 2015 - September 2016]

3. Comments received from:

- J. Butler, F. Campbell, S. Hudson, L. Turano, J. Amorosi, C. Bezeg, B. Friedman, j. Hall, L. Kreynin
- 4. Substance of evaluation (including reviewee's performance compared to expectations for a lawyer of the same seniority, strengths and weaknesses in the reviewee's performance in the last 12 months, improvements, if any, from prior year's review, etc.):

I met with Kaloma in the second half of Dec. 2016, before Christmas. I have expressed gratitude for his enthusiastic and positive attitude and hard work and noted that he was open to constructive criticism and improvement. I remarked that at least person noted significant improvement in the timelness of his work comapred to teh last year and greater focus on hsi work.

I then said that there are significant areas for improvement that we identified and lsited them. They were (1) the need to slow doan, pay attention to detail and maing sure that all of the deatils that need to be

reflected in teh document are there, (2) asking questions to be sure what you are doing and why, (3) seeking to underated key aspects of the overall transaction, and (4) conveying more confidence so that peoplke working with you know that you have a good handle on teh matters delegated.

Kaloma pushed back and asked for specific examples, at which time I pointed out issues thatwe had with exclusivity agreements for deal, such as mismatch between parties and signature pages and changes that he made which were adverse to our client. He accepted that but asked for other specific examples which I said that I didnt have at hand. The conversation remained friendly despite the pushback by him and concluded with me saying that we plan to meet again in June 2017 to discuss whether there have been improvements in these areas.

5. Did the reviewee receive a commendation for his/her pro bono work or recruiting efforts?

Yes

6. Comments from the reviewee regarding his or her evaluation of his or her performance.

See above.

7. Developmental priorities for the next year (including types of matters, level of responsibility, training, etc.)

See above

Submitted on: 3/28/2017, 6:03 PM